

## REMARKS

After entry of this Amendment, claims 3-6, 8-11, 16-19, 21-24, 26, 27, and 29-34 are pending in this application. Claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 16, 17, 21, and 22 are amended and claims 31-34 are added without introduction of new matter. Non-limiting support for the amended and added claims is provided below.

Claims 4-6, 9-11, 17-19, and 22-24 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but are indicated as reciting allowable subject matter. Claims 4, 9, 17, and 22 are rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 4, 9, 17, and 22 and claims 5, 6, 10, 11, 18, 19, 23, and 24 depending therefrom are in condition for allowance.

Claims 3, 8, 16, 21, 26, 27, 29, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0204802 to Sim in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,587,979 to Kraus. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 3 and 8 each recite “said respective scan clocks input to said at least two blocks each having overlapping pulses and a phase different from each other.” Independent claims 16 and 21 similarly recite “said respective scan clocks input to said at least two block means each having overlapping pulses and a phase different from each other.” A non-limiting example of the recited scan clocks is provided by the scan clocks SCLK\_A and SCLK\_B of Applicant’s Figure 2. As shown, the phases of the clocks are slightly shifted such that the pulses are overlapping but the respective blocks A and B receiving the scan clocks SCLK\_A and SCLK\_B do not operate simultaneously.

The Office Action cites the scan clocks SCK1 and SCK2 of Sim’s Figure 2 as teaching the recited scan clocks of claims 3, 8, 16, and 21, as previously presented. As shown, the scan clocks SCK1 and SCK2 of Sim’s Figure 2 do not have overlapping pulses. Sim teaches away from overlapping pulses, stating, “the active edges of the various scan clock signal should not overlap ... since only one bit of test data can be on the scan input line at one time.” Sim, para. 39. Kraus does not cure (nor is cited as addressing) this deficiency of Sim. Accordingly, as neither Sim nor Kraus teach the above-noted features of claims 3, 8, 16, and 21, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

New dependent claims 31-34 are added to recite features deleted from claims 3, 8, 16, and 21. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 31-34 are allowable at least in view of their dependence upon claims 3, 8, 16, and 21.

As all outstanding issues are addressed by this response, favorable reconsideration and allowance are solicited. If, however, there are remaining issues which can be addressed by a discussion with Applicant's representative, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney, Steven Dickey, at (202) 420-4756. Further, if there are any additional charges in connection with this filing, the Examiner is respectfully requested and authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 07-1043 therefor, under Order No. R2180.0188/P188.

Dated: December 6, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371

Steven T. Dickey

Registration No.: 54,066

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1825 Eye Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006-5403

(202) 420-2200

Attorneys for Applicant